arXiv:1609.02813v1 [math.OC] 9 Sep 2016

ANALYTIC SOLUTIONS FOR THE APPROXIMATED KANTOROVICH MASS TRANSFER PROBLEMS BY p-LAPLACIAN APPROACH

YANHUA WU[1] XIAOJUN LU[2]

1. Department of Sociology, School of Public Administration, Hohai University, 211189, Nanjing, China
2. Department of Mathematics & Jiangsu Key Laboratory of Engineering Mechanics, Southeast University, 210096, Nanjing, China

Abstract. This manuscript discusses the approximation of a global maximizer of the Kantorovich mass transfer problem through the approach of p-Laplacian equation. Using an approximation mechanism, the primal maximization problem can be transformed into a sequence of minimization problems. By applying the canonical duality theory, one is able to derive a sequence of analytic solutions for the minimization problems. In the final analysis, the convergence of the sequence to a global maximizer of the primal Kantorovich problem will be demonstrated.

1. Introduction

Complementary variational method has been applied in the study of finite deformation by Hellinger since the beginning of the 20th century. During the last few years, considerable effort has been taken to find minimizers for non-convex strain energy functionals with a double-well potential. In this respect, Ericksen bar is a typical model for the research of elastic phase transitions. In [10], R. W. Ogden et al. treated the Ericksen bar as a 1-D smooth compact manifold and discussed two classical loading devices, namely, hard device and soft device, by introducing a distributed axial body force. By applying the canonical duality method, the authors characterized the local energy extrema and the global energy minimizer for both hard device and soft device. This method proved to be very efficient in solving lots of open problems in the mechanical fields such as non-convex optimal design and control, nonlinear stability analysis of finite deformation, nonlinear elastic theory with residual strain, existence results for Nash equilibrium points of non-cooperative games etc. Interested readers can refer to [9, 10, 16] for more details.

This paper mainly addresses the Kantorovich problem in higher dimensions. Let $\Omega = \mathbb{B}(O_1, R_1)$ and $\Omega^* = \mathbb{B}(O_2, R_2)$ denote two open balls with centers O_1 and O_2,

Corresponding author: Xiaojun Lu, Department of Mathematics & Jiangsu Key Laboratory of Engineering Mechanics, Southeast University, 210096, Nanjing, China.

Keywords: Kantorovich mass transfer, p-Laplacian problem, canonical duality theory.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 35J20, 35J60, 49K20, 80A20.

radii R_1 and R_2 in the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$, respectively, and we denote $U := \Omega \cup \Omega^*$. Here we focus on the following two representative cases:

- $\Omega = \mathbb{B}(O_1, R_1)$, $\Omega^* = \mathbb{B}(O_2, R_2)$, $\Omega \cap \Omega^* = \emptyset$;
- $\Omega = \mathbb{B}(O_1, R_1)$, $\Omega^* = \mathbb{B}(O_1, R_2)$, $R_1 \neq R_2$.

Let f^+ and f^- be two nonnegative density functions in Ω and Ω^*, respectively, and satisfy the normalized balance condition

$$\int_\Omega f^+ dx = \int_{\Omega^*} f^- dx = 1.$$

For convenience's sake, let $f := f^+ - f^-$. First, let the admissible set $\mathscr{A}$ be defined as

$$\mathscr{A} := \Big\{ \phi \in W_0^{1,\infty}(U) \cap C(\overline{U}) \Big| \ \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1, \phi \text{ radially symmetric}, \ \phi = 0 \text{ on } \overline{\Omega \cap \Omega^*} \Big\},$$

where $W_0^{1,\infty}(U)$ is a Sobolev spaces. The aim is to find an analytic global maximizer (so-called *Kantorovich potential*) $u \in \mathscr{A}$ for the Kantorovich problem in the following form,

$$(\mathcal{P}) : K[u] = \max_{w \in \mathscr{A}} \Big\{ K[w] := \int_U w f dx \Big\}. \tag{1}$$

In this paper, we consider the Kantorovich problem through a p-Laplacian approach by introducing an approximation of the primal $(\mathcal{P})$ [6],

$$(\mathcal{P}^{(p)}) : \min_{w_p \in \mathscr{A}} \Big\{ I^{(p)}[w_p] := \int_U \Big(H^{(p)}(\nabla w_p) - w_p f \Big) dx \Big\}, \tag{2}$$

where $p > 2$ and $H^{(p)} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is defined as

$$H^{(p)}(\gamma) := |\gamma|^p / p,$$

and $I^{(p)}$ is called the *potential energy functional*. It's evident that

$$-\lim_{p \to +\infty} \min_{w_p \in \mathscr{A}} \{ I^{(p)}[w_p] \} = \max_{w \in \mathscr{A}} \{ K[w] \}.$$

Consequently, once a function $\bar{u}_p$ satisfying $I^{(p)}[\bar{u}_p] = \min_{w_p \in \mathscr{A}} \{ I^{(p)}[w_p] \}$ is obtained, then it will help find out an analytic Kantorovich potential $u = \lim_{p \to +\infty} \bar{u}_p$ in the L^∞ sense, which maximizes the primal problem $(\mathcal{P})$.

By variational calculus, one derives a corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation for $(\mathcal{P}^{(p)})$,

$$\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u_p|^{p-2} \nabla u_p) + f = 0, \quad \text{in } U \setminus \{\overline{\Omega \cap \Omega^*}\}, \tag{3}$$

equipped with the Dirichlet boundary condition. For the integer case, $p = 1$, by variational calculus, one obtains the mean curvature operator; $p = 2$, one has the Laplace operator(see [8]). For $p = n$, one derives the n-harmonic equation which is invariant under Möbius transformation. While for the fractional case, such as $p = 3/2$, $p-$Laplacian describes the flow through porous media. And glaciologist usually study the case $p \in (1, 4/3]$. For more background materials, please refer to [15].

Clearly, (3) is a nonlinear p-Laplacian problem which is difficult to solve by the direct approach [3, 8, 15]. However, by the canonical duality theory, one is able to

demonstrate the existence and uniqueness of the solution for the nonlinear differential equation, which establishes the equivalence between the global minimizer of $(\mathcal{P}^{(p)})$ and the solution of Euler-Lagrange equation (3).

At the moment, we would like to introduce the main theorems.

Theorem 1.1. *For any positive density functions $f^+ \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ and $f^- \in C(\overline{\Omega^*})$ satisfying the normalized balance condition, there exists a unique solution $\bar{u}_p \in \mathscr{A}$ for the Euler-Lagrange equation (3), which is at the same time a global minimizer for the approximation problem $(\mathcal{P}^{(p)})$. In particular, let*

$$E_p(x) := x^{(2p-2)/(p-2)}, x \in [0,1],$$

and E_p^{-1} stands for the inverse of E_p, then one has

- *$\Omega = \mathbb{B}(O_1, R_1)$, $\Omega^* = \mathbb{B}(O_2, R_2)$, $\Omega \cap \Omega^* = \emptyset$. $\bar{u}_p$ can be represented explicitly as*

$$\bar{u}_p(r) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_{R_1}^{r} F(\rho)\rho / E_p^{-1}(F^2(\rho)\rho^2)d\rho, & r \in [0, R_1], \\ \displaystyle\int_{R_2}^{r} G(\rho)\rho / E_p^{-1}(G^2(\rho)\rho^2)d\rho, & r \in [0, R_2], \end{cases}$$

  where F and G are defined as

$$\begin{cases} F(r) := -\Gamma(n/2)/(2\pi^{n/2}r^n) + \displaystyle\int_r^{R_1} f^+(\rho)\rho^{n-1}/r^n d\rho, & r \in [0, R_1], \\ G(r) := \Gamma(n/2)/(2\pi^{n/2}r^n) - \displaystyle\int_r^{R_2} f^-(\rho)\rho^{n-1}/r^n d\rho, & r \in [0, R_2]. \end{cases}$$

- *$\Omega = \mathbb{B}(O_1, R_1)$, $\Omega^* = \mathbb{B}(O_1, R_2)$, $R_1 > R_2 > 0$. $\bar{u}_p$ can be represented explicitly as*

$$\bar{u}_p(r) = \int_{R_2}^{r} F_p(\rho)\rho / E_p^{-1}(F_p^2(\rho)\rho^2)d\rho, \ r \in [R_2, R_1],$$

  where

$$F_p(r) := C_p R_2^n / r^n - \int_{R_2}^{r} f^+(\rho)\rho^{n-1}/r^n d\rho,$$

  and $C_p \in (0, \Gamma(n/2)/(2\pi^{n/2}R_2^n))$.

- *$\Omega = \mathbb{B}(O_1, R_1)$, $\Omega^* = \mathbb{B}(O_1, R_2)$, $R_2 > R_1 > 0$. $\bar{u}_p$ can be represented explicitly as*

$$\bar{u}_p(r) = \int_{R_1}^{r} G_p(\rho)\rho / E_p^{-1}(G_p^2(\rho)\rho^2)d\rho, \ r \in [R_1, R_2],$$

  where

$$G_p(r) := -D_p R_1^n / r^n + \int_{R_1}^{r} f^-(\rho)\rho^{n-1}/r^n d\rho,$$

  and $D_p \in (0, \Gamma(n/2)/(2\pi^{n/2}R_1^n))$.

Theorem 1.2. *For any positive density functions $f^+ \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ and $f^- \in C(\overline{\Omega^*})$ satisfying the normalized balance condition, there exists a global maximizer for the Kantorovich problem $(\mathcal{P})$.*

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, first we introduce some useful notations which will simplify our proof considerably. Then we apply the canonical dual transformation to deduce a perfect dual problem $(\mathcal{P}_d^{(p)})$ corresponding to $(\mathcal{P}^{(p)})$ and a pure complementary energy principle. Next we apply the canonical duality theory to prove Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2.

2. Proof of the main results

2.1. Some useful notations.

- $\overrightarrow{\theta_p}$ is given by
$$\overrightarrow{\theta_p}(x) = (\theta_{p,1}(x), \cdots, \theta_{p,n}(x)) = |\nabla w_p|^{p-2}\nabla w_p.$$
- $\Phi^{(p)} : \mathscr{A} \to L^\infty(U)$ is a nonlinear geometric mapping defined as
$$\Phi^{(p)}(w_p) := |\nabla w_p|^2.$$
For convenience's sake, denote $\xi_p := \Phi^{(p)}(w_p)$. It is evident that ξ_p belongs to the function space $\mathscr{U}$ given by
$$\mathscr{U} := \Big\{\phi \in L^\infty(U)\Big| 0 \le \phi \le 1\Big\}.$$
- $\Psi^{(p)} : \mathscr{U} \to L^\infty(U)$ is a canonical energy defined as
$$\Psi^{(p)}(\xi_p) := \xi_p^{p/2}/p,$$
which is a convex function with respect to ξ_p. For simplicity, denote $\zeta_p := \xi_p^{(p-2)/2}/2$, which is the Gâteaux derivative of $\Psi^{(p)}$ with respect to ξ_p. Moreover, ζ_p is invertible with respect to ξ_p and belongs to the function space $\mathscr{W}$,
$$\mathscr{W} := \Big\{\phi \in L^\infty(U)\Big| 0 \le \phi \le 1/2\Big\}.$$
- $\Psi_*^{(p)} : \mathscr{W} \to L^\infty(U)$ is defined as
$$\Psi_*^{(p)}(\zeta_p) := \xi_p\zeta_p - \Psi^{(p)}(\xi_p) = (1-2/p)2^{2/(p-2)}\zeta_p^{p/(p-2)}.$$
- λ_p is defined as $\lambda_p := 2\zeta_p$, and belongs to the function space $\mathscr{V}$,
$$\mathscr{V} := \Big\{\phi \in L^\infty(U)\Big| 0 \le \phi \le 1\Big\}.$$

2.2. Canonical duality techniques.

Definition 2.1. *By Legendre transformation, one defines a Gao-Strang total complementary energy functional $\Xi^{(p)}$,*
$$\Xi^{(p)}(u_p, \zeta_p) := \int_U \Big\{\Phi^{(p)}(u_p)\zeta_p - \Psi_*^{(p)}(\zeta_p) - fu_p\Big\}dx.$$

Next we introduce an important *criticality criterium* for the Gao-Strang total complementary energy functional.

Definition 2.2. $(\bar{u}_p, \bar{\zeta}_p) \in \mathscr{A} \times \mathscr{W}$ *is called a critical pair of* $\Xi^{(p)}$ *if and only if*

$$D_{u_p}\Xi^{(p)}(\bar{u}_p, \bar{\zeta}_p) = 0, \tag{4}$$

$$D_{\zeta_p}\Xi^{(p)}(\bar{u}_p, \bar{\zeta}_p) = 0, \tag{5}$$

where D_{u_p}, D_{ζ_p} *denote the partial Gâteaux derivatives of* $\Xi^{(p)}$*, respectively.*

Indeed, by variational calculus, we have the following observation from (4) and (5).

Lemma 2.3. *On the one hand, for any fixed* $\zeta_p \in \mathscr{W}$*, (3.4) is equivalent to the equilibrium equation*

$$\mathrm{div}(\lambda_p \nabla \bar{u}_p) + f = 0, \quad \text{in } U \setminus \{\overline{\Omega \cap \Omega^*}\}.$$

On the other hand, for any fixed $u_p \in \mathscr{A}$*, (5) is consistent with the constructive law*

$$\Phi^{(p)}(u_p) = D_{\zeta_p}\Psi_*^{(p)}(\bar{\zeta}_p).$$

Lemma 3.2.3 indicates that $\bar{u}_p$ from the critical pair $(\bar{u}_p, \bar{\zeta}_p)$ solves the Euler-Lagrange equation (3).

Definition 2.4. *From Definition 3.2.1, one defines the Gao-Strang pure complementary energy* $I_d^{(p)}$ *in the form*

$$I_d^{(p)}[\zeta_p] := \Xi^{(p)}(\bar{u}_p, \zeta_p),$$

where $\bar{u}_p$ *solves the Euler-Lagrange equation (3).*

To simplify the discussion, we use another representation of the pure energy $I_d^{(p)}$ given by the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *The pure complementary energy functional* $I_d^{(p)}$ *can be rewritten as*

$$I_d^{(p)}[\zeta_p] = -\int_U \Big\{ |\overrightarrow{\theta_p}|^2/(4\zeta_p) + (1-2/p)2^{2/(p-2)}\zeta_p^{p/(p-2)} \Big\},$$

where $\overrightarrow{\theta_p}$ *satisfies*

$$\mathrm{div}\overrightarrow{\theta_p} + f = 0 \text{ in } U, \tag{6}$$

equipped with a hidden boundary condition.

Proof. Through integrating by parts, one has

$$\begin{aligned} I_d^{(p)}[\zeta_p] \;=\; & \underbrace{-\int_U \Big\{ \mathrm{div}(2\zeta_p \nabla \bar{u}_p) + f \Big\} \bar{u}_p dx}_{(I)} \\ & \underbrace{-\int_U \Big\{ \zeta_p |\nabla \bar{u}_p|^2 + (1-2/p)2^{2/(p-2)}\zeta_p^{p/(p-2)} \Big\} dx}_{(II)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{u}_p$ solves the Euler-Lagrange equation (3), then the first part (I) disappears. Keeping in mind the definition of $\overrightarrow{\theta_p}$ and ζ_p, one reaches the conclusion. □

With the above discussion, next we establish a variational problem to the approximation problem $(\mathcal{P}^{(p)})$.

$$(\mathcal{P}_d^{(p)}) : \max_{\zeta_p \in \mathscr{W}} \Big\{ I_d^{(p)}[\zeta_p] = -\int_U \Big\{ |\overrightarrow{\theta_p}|^2/(4\zeta_p) + (1-2/p)2^{2/(p-2)}\zeta_p^{p/(p-2)} \Big\}. \tag{7}$$

Indeed, by calculating the Gâteaux derivative of $I_d^{(p)}$ with respect to ζ_p, one has

Lemma 2.6. *The variation of $I_d^{(p)}$ with respect to ζ_p leads to the dual algebraic equation (DAE), namely,*

$$|\overrightarrow{\theta_p}|^2 = (2\bar{\zeta}_p)^{(2p-2)/(p-2)}, \tag{8}$$

where $\bar{\zeta}_p$ is from the critical pair $(\bar{u}_p, \bar{\zeta}_p)$.

Taking into account the notation of λ_p, the identity (8) can be rewritten as

$$|\overrightarrow{\theta_p}|^2 = E_p(\lambda_p) = \lambda_p^{(2p-2)/(p-2)}. \tag{9}$$

It is evident E_p is monotonously increasing with respect to $\lambda \in [0,1]$.

2.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.1.** From the above discussion, one deduces that, once θ_p is given, then the analytic solution of the Euler-Lagrange equation (3) can be represented as

$$\bar{u}_p(x) = \int_{x_0}^{x} \eta_p(t)dt, \tag{10}$$

where $x \in \overline{U}, x_0 \in \partial U$, $\eta_p := \theta_p/\lambda_p$. Together with (9), one sees that $\lim_{p\to+\infty} |\nabla \bar{u}_p| = 1$, which is consistent with the a-priori estimate in [5]. Next we verify that $\bar{u}_p$ is exactly a global minimizer for $(\mathcal{P}^{(p)})$ and $\bar{\zeta}_p$ is a global maximizer for $(\mathcal{P}_d^{(p)})$.

Lemma 2.7. *(Canonical duality theory) For any positive density functions $f^+ \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ and $f^- \in C(\overline{\Omega^*})$ satisfying the normalized balance condition, there exists a unique radially symmetric solution $\bar{u}_p \in \mathscr{A}$ for the Euler-Lagrange equations (3) with Dirichlet boundary in the form of (10), which is a unique global minimizer over $\mathscr{A}$ for the approximation problem $(\mathcal{P}^{(p)})$. And the corresponding $\bar{\zeta}_p$ is a unique global maximizer over $\mathscr{W}$ for the dual problem $(\mathcal{P}_d^{(p)})$. Moreover, the following duality identity holds,*

$$I^{(p)}(\bar{u}_p) = \min_{u_p \in \mathscr{A}} I^{(p)}(u_p) = \Xi^{(p)}(\bar{u}_p, \bar{\zeta}_p) = \max_{\zeta_p \in \mathscr{W}} I_d^{(p)}(\zeta_p) = I_d^{(p)}(\bar{\zeta}_p). \tag{11}$$

Lemma 3.2.7 shows that the maximization of the pure complementary energy functional $I_d^{(p)}$ is perfectly dual to the minimization of the potential energy functional $I^{(p)}$. Indeed, identity (11) indicates there is no duality gap between them.

Proof. We divide our proof into three parts. In the first and second parts, we discuss the uniqueness of θ_p for both cases. Global extremum will be studied in the third part. It is worth noticing that the first and second parts are similar to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

First Part: $\Omega = \mathbb{B}(O_1, R_1)$, $\Omega^* = \mathbb{B}(O_2, R_2)$, $\Omega \cap \Omega^* = \emptyset$

(1) Discussion in Ω

Let $O_1 = (a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n)$. Actually, a radially symmetric solution for the Euler-Lagrange equation (3) is of the form

$$\overrightarrow{\theta_p} = \overline{F}_p(r)((x_1 - a_1, \cdots, x_n - a_n)) = \overline{F}_p\Big(\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(x_i - a_i)^2}\Big)((x_1 - a_1, \cdots, x_n - a_n)),$$

where

$$\overline{F}_p(r) = C_p R_1^n / r^n + \int_r^{R_1} f^+(\rho)\rho^{n-1}/r^n d\rho$$

is the unique solution of the differential equation

$$\overline{F}_p'(r) + n\overline{F}_p(r)/r = -f^+(r)/r, \quad r \in (0, R_1].$$

Recall that $\bar{u}_p(R_1) = 0$, as a result,

$$\bar{u}_p(r) = \int_{R_1}^{r} \Big(R_1^n C_p + \int_\rho^{R_1} f^+(r) r^{n-1} dr\Big) / \Big(\rho^{n-1}\lambda_p(\rho)\Big) d\rho, \quad r \in (0, R_1].$$

As a matter of fact, if $\bar{u}_p \in C[0, R_1]$, we have

$$\lim_{\rho \to 0^+} \Big\{R_1^n C_p + \int_\rho^{R_1} f^+(r) r^{n-1} dr\Big\} = 0,$$

which indicates

$$C_p = -\Gamma(n/2)/(2\pi^{n/2} R_1^n),$$

from the normalized balance condition

$$\int_\Omega f^+(x)dx = 2\pi^{n/2}/\Gamma(n/2) \int_0^{R_1} f^+(r) r^{n-1} dr = 1.$$

(2) Discussion in Ω^*

Let $O_2 = (b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_n)$. In fact, a radially symmetric solution for the Euler-Lagrange equation (3) is of the form

$$\overrightarrow{\theta_p} = \overline{G}_p(r)((x_1 - b_1, \cdots, x_n - b_n)) = \overline{G}_p\Big(\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(x_i - b_i)^2}\Big)((x_1 - b_1, \cdots, x_n - b_n)),$$

where

$$\overline{G}_p(r) = D_p R_2^n / r^n - \int_r^{R_2} f^-(\rho)\rho^{n-1}/r^n d\rho$$

is the unique solution of the differential equation

$$\overline{G}_p'(r) + n\overline{G}_p(r)/r = f^-(r)/r, \quad r \in (0, R_2].$$

Recall that $\bar{u}_p(R_2) = 0$, as a result,

$$\bar{u}_p(r) = \int_{R_2}^{r} \Big(R_2^n D_p - \int_\rho^{R_2} f^-(r) r^{n-1} dr\Big) / \Big(\rho^{n-1}\lambda_p(\rho)\Big) d\rho, \quad r \in (0, R_2].$$

Indeed, if $\bar{u}_p \in C[0, R_2]$, then by applying the similar contradiction method as above, one has

$$\lim_{\rho \to 0^+} \Big\{ R_2^n D_p - \int_\rho^{R_2} f^-(r) r^{n-1} dr \Big\} = 0,$$

which indicates

$$D_p = \Gamma(n/2)/(2\pi^{n/2} R_2^n)$$

from the normalized balance condition

$$\int_{\Omega^*} f^-(x)dx = 2\pi^{n/2}/\Gamma(n/2) \int_0^{R_2} f^-(r) r^{n-1} dr = 1.$$

Second Part: $\Omega = \mathbb{B}(O_1, R_1)$, $\Omega^* = \mathbb{B}(O_1, R_2)$, $R_1 \neq R_2$

(1) $R_1 > R_2 > 0$

Let $O_1 = (a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n)$. Actually, a radially symmetric solution for the Euler-Lagrange equation (3) is of the form

$$\overrightarrow{\theta_p} = F_p(r)((x_1 - a_1, \cdots, x_n - a_n)) = F_p\Big(\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - a_i)^2}\Big)((x_1 - a_1, \cdots, x_n - a_n)),$$

where

$$F_p(r) = C_p R_2^n / r^n - \int_{R_2}^r f^+(\rho) \rho^{n-1} / r^n d\rho$$

is the unique solution of the differential equation

$$F_p'(r) + n F_p(r)/r = -f^+(r)/r, \quad r \in [R_2, R_1].$$

Recall that $\bar{u}_p(R_2) = 0$, consequently,

$$\bar{u}_p(r) = \int_{R_2}^r \Big(R_2^n C_p - \int_{R_2}^\rho f^+(r) r^{n-1} dr \Big) / \Big(\rho^{n-1} \lambda_p(\rho) \Big) d\rho, \quad r \in [R_2, R_1].$$

Let

$$\tilde{F}(r) := 1/R_2^n \int_{R_2}^r f^+(\rho) \rho^{n-1} d\rho, \quad r \in [R_2, R_1].$$

Since $f^+ > 0$, then $\tilde{F} \in C[R_2, R_1]$ is a strictly increasing function with respect to $r \in [R_2, R_1]$ and consequently is invertible. Let $\tilde{F}^{-1}$ be its inverse function, which is also a strictly increasing function. From (9), we see that there exists a unique piecewise continuous function $\lambda_p(x) \geq 0$. Since

$$\lim_{r \to \tilde{F}^{-1}(C_p)} (-\tilde{F}(r) + C_p) R_2^n / (r^{n-1} \lambda_p(r)) = 0,$$

thus $\bar{u}_p$ is continuous at the point $r = \tilde{F}^{-1}(C_p)$. As a result, $\bar{u}_p \in C[R_2, R_1]$. Notice that $\bar{u}_p(R_1) = 0$ and we can determine the constant C_p uniquely. Indeed, let

$$\mu_p(\rho, t) := \Big(R_2^n t - \int_{R_2}^\rho f^+(r) r^{n-1} dr \Big) / \Big(\rho^{n-1} \lambda_p(\rho, t) \Big)$$

and

$$M_k(t) := \int_{R_2}^{\tilde{F}^{-1}(t)} \mu_p(\rho,t)d\rho + \int_{\tilde{F}^{-1}(t)}^{R_1} \mu_p(\rho,t)d\rho,$$

where $\lambda_p(\rho,t)$ is from (9). It is evident that λ_p depends on C_p. As a matter of fact, it is easy to check M is strictly increasing with respect to t, which leads to

$$C_p = M_p^{-1}(0).$$

Furthermore, by a similar discussion as in [16], we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} C_p = \tilde{F}((R_1+R_2)/2).$$

(2) $0 < R_1 < R_2$

In fact, a radially symmetric solution for the Euler-Lagrange equation (3) is of the form

$$\overrightarrow{\theta_p} = G_p(r)((x_1-a_1,\cdots,x_n-a_n)) = G_p\Big(\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(x_i-a_i)^2}\Big)((x_1-a_1,\cdots,x_n-a_n)),$$

where

$$G_p(r) = -D_pR_1^n/r^n + \int_{R_1}^{r} f^-(\rho)\rho^{n-1}/r^n d\rho$$

is the unique solution of the differential equation

$$G_p'(r) + nG_p(r)/r = f^-(r)/r, \quad r\in[R_1,R_2].$$

Recall that $\bar{u}_p(R_1) = 0$, as a result,

$$\bar{u}_p(r) = \int_{R_1}^{r}\Big(-R_1^nD_p + \int_{R_1}^{\rho} f^-(r)r^{n-1}dr\Big)/\Big(\rho^{n-1}\lambda_p(\rho)\Big)d\rho, \quad r\in[R_1,R_2].$$

Let

$$\tilde{G}(r) := 1/R_1^n\int_{R_1}^{r} f^-(\rho)\rho^{n-1}d\rho, \quad r\in[R_1,R_2].$$

Since $f^- > 0$, then $\tilde{G}\in C[R_1,R_2]$ is a strictly increasing function with respect to $r\in[R_1,R_2]$ and consequently is invertible. Let $\tilde{G}^{-1}$ be its inverse function, which is also a strictly increasing function. From (9), we see that there exists a unique piecewise continuous function $\lambda_p(x)\geq 0$. Since

$$\lim_{r\to G^{-1}(D_p)}(G(r)-D_p)R_1^n/(r^{n-1}\lambda_p(r)) = 0,$$

thus $\bar{u}_p$ is continuous at the point $r = G^{-1}(D_p)$. As a result, $\bar{u}_p\in C[R_1,R_2]$. Notice that $\bar{u}_p(R_2) = 0$ and we can determine the constant D_p uniquely. Indeed, let

$$\eta_p(\rho,t) := \Big(-R_1^nt + \int_{R_1}^{\rho} f^-(r)r^{n-1}dr\Big)/\Big(\rho^{n-1}\lambda_p(\rho,t)\Big)$$

and

$$N_p(t) := \int_{R_1}^{\tilde{G}^{-1}(t)} \eta_p(\rho,t)d\rho + \int_{\tilde{G}^{-1}(t)}^{R_2} \eta_p(\rho,t)d\rho,$$

where $\lambda_p(\rho,t)$ is from (9). It is evident that λ_p depends on C_p. As a matter of fact, it is easy to check N_p is strictly increasing with respect to t, which leads to

$$D_p = N_p^{-1}(0).$$

Furthermore, by a similar discussion as in [16], we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} D_p = \tilde{G}((R_1+R_2)/2).$$

Third Part:

On the one hand, for any test function $\phi \in \mathscr{A}$ satisfying $\nabla\phi \neq 0$ a.e. in U, the second variational form $\delta_\phi^2 I^{(p)}$ with respect to ϕ is equal to

$$\int_U \Big\{ |\nabla \bar{u}_p|^{p-2}|\nabla\phi|^2 + (p-2)|\nabla\bar{u}_p|^{p-4}(\nabla\bar{u}_p\cdot\nabla\phi)^2 \Big\} dx. \tag{12}$$

On the other hand, for any test function $\psi \in \mathscr{W}$ satisfying $\psi \neq 0$ a.e. in U, the second variational form $\delta_\psi^2 I_d^{(p)}$ with respect to ψ is equal to

$$-\int_U \psi^2 \Big\{ |\overrightarrow{\theta_p}|^2/(2\bar{\zeta}_p^3) + 1/(p-2)2^{p/(p-2)}\zeta_p^{(4-p)/(p-2)} \Big\} dx. \tag{13}$$

From (12) and (13), one deduces immediately that

$$\delta_\phi^2 I^{(p)}(\bar{u}_p) > 0, \quad \delta_\psi^2 J_d^{(p)}(\bar{\zeta}_p) < 0.$$

Together with the uniqueness of $\overrightarrow{\theta_p}$ discussed in the first and second parts, the proof is concluded. □

Consequently, we reach the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 by summarizing the above discussion.

2.4. **Proof of Theorem 1.2:** According to Rellich-Kondrachov Compactness Theorem, since

$$\sup_k |\bar{u}_k| \leq C(R_1,R_2)$$

and

$$\sup_k |\nabla\bar{u}_k| \leq 1,$$

then, there exists a subsequence(without any confusion, we still denote as) $\{\bar{u}_k\}_k$ and $u \in W_0^{1,\infty}(U)\cap C(\overline{U})$ such that

$$\bar{u}_k \to u \ (k\to\infty) \text{ in } L^\infty(U), \tag{14}$$

$$\nabla\bar{u}_k \underset{\backslash}{*} \nabla u \ (k\to\infty) \text{ weakly } * \text{ in } L^\infty(U). \tag{15}$$

It remains to check that u satisfies (5). From (19), one has

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} \|\nabla\bar{u}_k\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq \sup_{k\to\infty} \|\nabla\bar{u}_k\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq 1.$$

Consequently, one reaches the conclusion of Theorem 1.2 by summarizing the above discussion.

Remark 2.8. *Frankly speaking, the uniqueness of the global minimizer for the primal problem does not hold when U is a general Lipschitz domain. As $p \to \infty$, we have the infinity harmonic equation*

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_j \partial x_k} = f.$$

This equation has often been used in image processing and optimal Lipschitz extensions.

Acknowledgment: This project is partially supported by US Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR FA9550-10-1-0487), Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province (BK 20130598), National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC 71673043, 71273048, 71473036, 11471072), the Scientific Research Foundation for the Returned Overseas Chinese Scholars, Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities on the Field Research of Commercialization of Marriage between China and Vietnam (No. 2014B15214). This work is also supported by Open Research Fund Program of Jiangsu Key Laboratory of Engineering Mechanics, Southeast University (LEM16B06).

References

[1] L. Ambrosio, Optimal transport maps in Monge-Kantorovich problem, ICM, 3(2002), 1-3.
[2] L. Ambrosio, Lecture Notes on Optimal Transfer Problems, preprint.
[3] J. Bourgain, H. Brezis, Sur l'équation div $u = f$, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I334(2002), 973-976.
[4] L. A. Caffarelli, M. Feldman and R. J. MCcann, Constructing optimal maps for Monge's transport problem as a limit of strictly convex costs, Journal of AMS, 15(2001), 1-26.
[5] L. C. Evans, Partial differential equations and Monge-Kantorovich mass transfer(survey paper).
[6] L. C. Evans and W. Gangbo, Differential equations methods for the Monge-Kantorovich mass transfer problem, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 653(1999).
[7] L. C. Evans, Three singular variational problems, preprint, 2002.
[8] L. C. Evans, Partial Differential Equations, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Vol. 19, 2002.
[9] D. Y. Gao, G. Strang, Geometric nonlinearity: Potential energy, complementary energy, and the gap function, Quart. Appl. Math. 47(3)(1989), 487-504.
[10] D. Y. Gao, R. W. Ogden, Multiple solutions to non-convex variational problems with implications for phase transitions and numerical computation. Q. Jl Mech. Appl. Math. **61(4)**, 497-522(2008)
[11] D. Y. Gao and X. Lu, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. (2016), DOI 10.1007/s00033-016-0636-0.
[12] W. Gangbo and R. J. McCann, The geometry of optimal transportation, Acta Math., 177(1996), 113-161.
[13] L. V. Kantorovich, On the transfer of masses, Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR 37(1942), 227-229 (Russian).
[14] L. V. Kantorovich, On a problem of Monge, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk. 3(1948), 225-226.
[15] J. L. Lions and E. Magenes, Problèmes aux limites non homogènes et applications I-III, Dunod, Paris, 1968-1970.
[16] X. Lu and D. Y. Gao, Analytic solution for the 1-D Kantorovich mass transfer problem, preprint, 2015.
[17] Y. Wu and X. Lu, An approximation method for the optimization of p-th moment of $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued random variable. preprint, 2015.
[18] G. Monge, Mémoire sur la théorie des déblais et de remblais, Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Sciences de Paris, avec les Mémoire de Mathématique et de Physique pour la même année, (1781), 666-704.
[19] S. T. Rachev: The Monge-Kantorovich mass transferance problem and its stochastic applications. Theory of Prob. and Appl., **29**, 647-676(1984)

[20] V. N. Sudakov, Geometric problems in the theory of infinite-dimensional probability distributions, Proceedings of Steklov Institute 141(1979), 1-178.
[21] A. M. Vershik, Some remarks on the infinite-dimensional problems of linear programming, Russian Math. Survey, 25(1970), 117-124.